

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar. The amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into a substitute specification and abstract. Attached are two versions of the substitute specification and abstract, a marked-up version showing the revisions, as well as a clean version. No new matter has been added.

II. Drawing Amendments

As mentioned above, proposed drawing amendments are submitted herewith under a separate cover letter. Specifically, Figure 1 has been amended to re-label reference element “1001” as “1001a,” in order for Figure 1 to remain consistent with the specification.

This drawing amendment is editorial in nature and does not add new matter to the application.

III. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 7 and 8 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Further, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify features of the invention

recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the reference relied upon in the rejection discussed below.

It is also noted that claims 1-6 and 9-21 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

Claims 1, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Plourde, Jr. et al. (U.S. 7,281,839). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9-21 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an apparatus including a reception means for receiving, as information indicating preprogrammed recording settings, a date of distribution, a time of distribution, and a distribution source of distributed information. In addition, claim 1 recites displaying means for displaying a display screen indicating a two-dimensional matrix having the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings incorporated therein. Further, claim 1 recites that, when a plurality of pieces of the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings are incorporated into the two-dimensional matrix, the plurality of pieces of the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings are respectively incorporated into a plurality of divided areas of the two-dimensional matrix based

on a respective date of distribution indicated by a respective piece of the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings. Plourde fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features, as required by independent claim 1.

Rather, Plourde teaches a program guide that displays a portion of available channel numbers and a time of a program/recording, to identify programs that are available or are to be recorded (see Fig. 10, wherein program guide displays programs based on channel number and time slot). Further, Plourde teaches displaying a list of programs to be recorded and identifying the channel, time, and date of each program to be recorded (see Fig. 17).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Plourde teaches a program guide that displays programs/recordings based on channel number and time slot, but fails to disclose or suggest that a plurality of pieces of the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings (i.e., indicating a date of distribution and a time of distribution) are respectively incorporated into a plurality of divided areas of the two-dimensional matrix based on a respective date of distribution indicated by a respective piece of the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings, as required by claim 1.

In other words, Plourde merely teaches that the program guide is displayed based on channel number and time slot, but still fails to disclose or suggest the two-dimensional matrix that incorporates information to be displayed based on a date of distribution, wherein the information includes a time of distribution, as required by claim 1.

Additionally, it is noted that Plourde also teaches displaying a list of programs to be recorded and identifying the channel, time, and date of each program, but fails to disclose or suggest the two-dimensional matrix that incorporates information based on a date of distribution,

as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, referring to claim 1, since (i) each piece of information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings identifies a respective date of distribution and a respective time of distribution, (ii) the two-dimensional matrix is defined by a date of distribution and includes a time of distribution, and (iii) the two-dimensional matrix incorporates each piece of information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings based on a respective date of distribution, the invention of claim 1 requires a structure that, based on the two-dimensional matrix, the user has the ability to easily determine whether or not the plurality of pieces of the information indicating preprogrammed recording settings are redundant (see for example, but not limited to, Fig. 2).

On the other hand, Plourde merely teaches a structure of displaying a few channels of a program guide, allowing the user to view which of the displayed channels are set to be recorded (see Fig. 10), and teaches a structure of displaying every program to be recorded and the corresponding recording information (see Fig. 17).

In view of the above, it is evident that the structure provided by Plourde does not result in, a user having the ability to easily whether or not the plurality of pieces of the information indicating preprogrammed recording settings are redundant, based on the two-dimensional matrix incorporating information based on a date of distribution.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9-21 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Plourde.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Plourde or elsewhere in the prior art

of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Plourde to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9-21 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

V. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 2-9, 11, and 13-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combination of Plourde, Beach et al. (U.S. 2004/0013409), Young et al. (U.S. 6,498,895), Proehl et al. (U.S. 6,532,589), Akamatsu et al. (U.S. 7,224,886), Kobb (U.S. 7,356,246), and Hanai et al. (U.S. 7,218,839).

These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended dependent claims 2-6 and 9-21, since, Beach, Young, Proehl, Akamatsu, Kobb and Hanai (secondary references) do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from the Plourde reference. Therefore, no obvious combination of Plourde with any of the secondary references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9-21 that depend therefrom.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroyuki KONDO et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2008.11.26 12:26:47 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 26, 2008